8

REMARKS

This Application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Official Action mailed August 19, 2005. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and favorable action in this Application.

Claims 1, 2, 4, 7-15, and 17-19 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Garnett, et al. Independent Claims 1, 11, and 17 view of Stiffler, et al. have been amended to include all of the features of dependent Independent Claims 1, 11, and 17 recite in Claims 5 and 6. general the ability to couple a second processing device to a bus prior to decoupling from the bus a first processing device By contrast, the Garnett, et al. having access thereto. patent does not provide any disclosure of an ability to have two processing devices coupled to a bus at the same time. Examiner readily admits that the Garnett, et al. patent fails to disclose an ability to couple one of a plurality of devices to a bus prior to decoupling another one of the plurality of devices from the bus. To offset the deficiencies of the Garnett, et al. patent, the Examiner cites the Stiffler, et al. patent for its pre-grant bus access request technique. However, all of the processing elements in the Stiffler, al. patent are coupled to the bus and a bus access request is pre-granted for a particular processing element to inform the particular processing element that it is next to have access to the bus once it becomes available after being used by the previously granted processing element. There is no coupling of processing elements to the bus within the Stiffler, et al. The structure that would result from placing the pregrant bus access request technique of the Stiffler, et al. patent where all processing elements are coupled to the bus and a particular processing element is merely informed that it

is next in line to have access to a bus into the bridge system of the Garnett, et al. patent where two processing devices cannot be coupled to the bus at the same time would still lack an ability to couple a second processing device to a bus prior to decoupling from the bus a first processing device having claimed invention. required by the thereto as access Moreover, the Garnett, et al. and Stiffler, et al. patents are incompatible with each other as the Garnett, et al. patent does not allow more than one processing device to be coupled to the bus while the Stiffler, et al. patent discloses having all processing elements coupled to the bus. Applicant respectfully submits that Claims 1, 2, 4, 7-15, and 17-19 are not anticipated by the Garnett, et al. patent.

Claims 3, 16, and 20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. \$103(a) as being unpatentable over Garnett, et al. in view of Stiffler, et al. and further in view of PCI Local Bus Independent Claims 1, 11, and 17 from which Specification. Claims 3, 16, and 20 depend have been shown above to be patentably distinct from the proposed Garnett, et Moreover, the PCI Local Bus Stiffler, et al. combination. any additional Specification does not include combinable with the either the Garnett, et al. or Stiffler, et al. patents that would be material to patentability of the claims. Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that Claims 16, and 20 are patentably distinct from the proposed al. - PCI Local Garnett, et al. - Stiffler, et Specification.

10

CONCLUSION

Applicant has now made an earnest attempt to place the Application in condition for allowance. For the foregoing reasons and for other reasons clearly apparent, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and full allowance of all pending claims.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any amount required or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-0384 of BAKER BOTTS L.L.P.

Respectfully submitted,

BAKER BOTTS L.L.P.

Attorneys for Applicant

Charles S. Fish

Req. No. 35,870

November 18, 2005

CORRESPONDENCE ADDRESS:

2001 Ross Avenue, Suite 600 Dallas, TX 75201-2980

(214) 953-6509

Customer Number: 05073